



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-306776-20

Case Reference / Description	191 no. apartments and associated site works. Site 2, Northern Cross, Malahide Road, Dublin 17.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	27 th May 2020	Start Time	10:00 a.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:30 a.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Kevin Carron, on behalf of the applicant
Paul Sinclair, Architect
Michael Hughes, Engineer
Alanagh Gannon, Landscape Architect
Paul Turley, Planning Consultant
Dirk Koetze, Hughes Planning

Representing Planning Authority

Diarmuid Murphy, Senior Executive Planner

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, the Local Authority (LA) and introductions were made. The procedural matters relating to the meeting were as follows:

- The written record will be placed on the pre-application consultation file and will be made public, along with that file, should an application arise following the conclusion of this consultation process,
- ABP received a submission from the P.A on 30th March 2020 providing the records of consultations held pursuant to section 247 and its written opinion of considerations related to proper planning and sustainable development that may have a bearing on ABP's decision,
- The consultation meeting will not involve a merits-based assessment of the proposed development,
- The meeting will focus on key site-specific issues at strategic overview level, and whether the documents submitted require further consideration and/or amendment in order to constitute a reasonable basis for an application.
- Key considerations will be examined in the context of the statutory development plan for the area and section 28 Ministerial Guidelines where relevant,
- A reminder that neither the holding of a consultation or the forming of an opinion shall prejudice ABP or the LA concerned in relation to any other of their respective functions under the Planning Acts or any other enactments and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings.

The ABP representatives acknowledged the letter dated 3rd March 2020 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. Prospective applicant advised of the need to comply with definition of SHD as set out in the Act of 2016, in relation to thresholds of development. It was also noted that the Inspector dealing with the pre-application consultation request would be different to who would deal with the application when it was submitted. Recording of the meeting is prohibited.

Agenda

- 1. Public realm improvements and amenity corridor**
- 2. Design strategy – ground floor interface and building legibility**
- 3. Car parking and Transport**
- 4. Flood Risk**
- 5. Any other matters.**

1. Public realm improvements and amenity corridor

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- How the proposed development plugs in to the wider area and the existing open space to the east.
- The objective to provide a linear greenway connection along the Mayne River, north of the site.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Layout revisions to take account of tree retention/removal and that a linear park is an objective in the LAP to the north of the site.
- Examine impacts on the western boundary of the site with reference to future development potential. Detail any potential overshadowing and loss of daylight.
- In relation to the public open space and the buffer on the eastern side of the site explain where the public space begins and ends.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is a three-way phased approach to the entire area, the proposed development is block 2 of the overall masterplan. The difference with the previous application is that there is no stepping or retail uses at ground floor levels. The former link road is omitted and will be dealt with in another future development.
- Tree retention has been maximised, only category C trees are being removed.
- The central open space is part of the masterplan and future connections are being provided to this space.
- Provision for future entrance to the linear park north of the site, if that objective takes place.
- There is no impact on the Malahide bypass road green route and its future plans.

Further ABP comments:

- Detail all the public realm improvements and show how the site connects with existing open space.
- Outline the relationship of this proposed development with other blocks and particularly open space.
- Show how the linear greenway connections can be achieved to the north of the site along the Mayne River.

2. Design strategy – ground floor interface and building legibility

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The design approach employed to successfully integrate the block at street level and the open space to the east. Also, to show how the proposed block deals with the existing car park to the west in terms of interface, if any, and boundary treatment.
- Greater explanation of how the building is legible from the street, in terms of wayfinding and entrance detail.

Planning Authority's response:

- The ground floor needs to be secure and external circulation areas and private areas are required.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is level access from the public road and a plaza off the public road is at the same level. Each core is accessible from the ground plane.
- There is a buffer space both private and public between the apartments and the existing public open space of 1.5 metres, that slopes.
- Eastern plaza overlooks the public park.
- The western plaza contains ground floor linkages and a boundary to the car park.
- Parking is on one level and contained in an under-croft level, as the site slopes downwards to the north.
- Green planting will screen apartments from the plaza area. There are a number of different entrances from levels that are overlooking the park.

Further ABP comments:

- Cross sections would be beneficial in showing the interface and relationship to public open spaces.
- Detail the entrances to each core, highlight the doorway/threshold entrances.
- In relation to unit 6 B, the relationship with the access road should be explained in greater detail, specifically with regard to height above ground level.

3. Car parking and transport**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- The proposed quantum of car parking spaces and details concerning car park management.

Planning Authority's response:

- There has been some reduction in the car parking spaces from the previous application, bicycle spaces require explanation.
- How will car parking spaces will be actively managed.
- Will there be an examination of commuting patterns, particularly the potential for transport connections to the airport.
- A basement impact assessment taking account of any flooding should be submitted.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- 127 car parking spaces were proposed on the previous application, 119 car parking spaces are now proposed, due to a reconfiguration at the north end of the site.
- Parking is at a basement and surface level, includes disability and GoCar spaces. Parking spaces will be actively managed.
- 424 bicycle spaces are being proposed with a 2.2 ratio and will be at basement and surface level.
- Public transport is plentiful and frequent in the local area. Bus stops are within walking distance of the proposed development.
- There is a mobility management plan and traffic/transport impact assessment.

- A residential travel plan and car parking management plan is currently in consultation with the planning authority.
- None of the site will be offered to be taken in charge.

Further ABP comments:

- Detail how car parking will be managed and include in an overall building management plan.
- Show bicycle parking.
- Outline public transport in the local area and explain its proximity and frequency.

4. Flood Risk

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Potential flood risk on and off site.

Planning Authority's response:

- Look to providing green roofs and SuDs.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- No flood risk is envisaged.
- There will be a flood risk statement submitted, there is no impact on the natural overland flood route to the Mayne River.
- Green roofs and SUD's will be outlined.

Further ABP comments:

- This is flood zone C, look to incorporate SUD's and show if there are any off-site flooding impacts.
- Ensure all technical reports are up to date.
- There is no further information sought at application stage.

5. Any Other Matters

Planning Authority's comments:

- Maximise sunlight/daylight for the courtyards.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Aware of pinch points for residential amenities on the western elevation block, these apartments are dual aspect and comply with daylight and sunlight analysis.

Further ABP comments:

- Examine any potential pinch points that may affect residential amenities on the western elevation of the block, especially the projecting arm at the centre.

Conclusions

The representatives of ABP emphasised the following:

- There should be no delay in making the planning application once the public notice has been published
- Sample notices, application form and procedures are available on the ABP website
- Irish Water would like prospective applicants to contact Irish Water at cdsdesignqa@water.ie **between the Pre-Application Consultation and Application stages**, to confirm details of their proposed development and their proposed design.
- The email address to which applicants should send their **applications** to Irish Water as a prescribed body is spatialplanning@water.ie

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
June, 2020